



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,550	12/18/2001	Toshimichi Kishimoto	62807-023	9299
20277	7590	04/07/2006	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			POLTORAK, PIOTR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/021,550	Applicant(s) KISHIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter Poltorak	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 8/1/05 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/23/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

1. The drawing submitted on 8/1/05 have been accepted.
2. Applicant's arguments were carefully considered.
3. In light of the amendments the 112 first paragraph rejection has been withdrawn.
4. For clarity only Huang as a primary reference is used in rejection of the amended claim limitations. As a result, the examiner addresses applicant's argument directed towards Huang's teaching.
5. Applicant argues that art of record focuses much more on user access instead of manager access. Particularly, Huang is actually directed to controlling access to a switching system, not a storage management system.

The argument has been carefully considered but found non persuasive.

The term interpreted broadly identifies a system that manages access to a storage, the concept inherently present in any computer implementation. Computers inherently use storage to store, access and modify files.

6. Applicant argues that erasing software for an interface object of the type recited in the amended independent claims is not taught by Huang.

Applicant argument has been carefully considered but found non persuasive. The examiner points to Huang, col. 15 lines 39-42.

7. Applicant amended the claims to articulate the concept of a key. The limitation reciting the amended key are addressed in the current office action, below.

8. Claims 1-19 and 21 have been examined.

Claim Objections

9. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "is" in claim 5 line 3 seems to be unnecessary. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6192361) in view of each of Moshfeghi (U.S. Patent No. 6476833).

As per claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-19 and 21 Huang discloses a management object for controlling management access in response to a request from a manager (remote computer, 10) connected to the storage management system through a network said management object authenticating a second manager ID and a second password received through the network from the manager (col. 7 lines 8-25), in accordance with a first ID and a first password stored beforehand to authenticate the manager (Fig. 2 and col. 7 lines 17-19), a storage configuration information file containing settings of the storage management system (col. 8 line 64-col. 9 line 6); and a temporary software interface object for accessing the setting in the storage configuration information file through the network (GUI as shown in Fig. 12 for example), said temporary software interface object to be created by said management object when both authentication of the second manager ID and authentication of the second password by said management object succeed (col. 8 lines 16-18), and to be expired after a predetermined permission time (col. 15 lines 39-42), wherein the authenticated manager's access to the settings contained in the storage configuration information file is permitted only while the temporary software interface object exists (col. 15 lines 39-49 and col. 7 lines 59-67), said temporary software interface object permitting an access to the settings in the storage configuration information file is erased after lapse of said predetermined permission time frame so as to expire access by the authenticated manager (col. 15 lines 39-42). Huang teaches that the temporary software interface object created by the management object is expired when a log-out sent from the authenticated manager

at the end of the access is received (col. 7 lines 59-67), and that the temporary software interface object created for the authenticated manager enables use of a subset of management functions available through the storage management system when accessing the storage configuration information file and the subset of management functions is defined by a stored information file for the authenticated manager from among a plurality of individualized stored information files for a plurality of managers (col. 12 lines 10-41).

Huang does not disclose that said management object transmits a key, needed for communication through the network with the temporary software interface object to the authenticated manager to enable management access to the storage configuration information file.

Moshfeghi discloses keys needed for communication through the network with a software interface to enable access to files (links, Moshfeghi , col. 2 lines 16-27 and col. 3 lines 8-42) that is received by a client with the management object (e.g. Moshfeghi , col. 21 lines 32-42), wherein the key represents an address of the temporary software interface object (e.g. Moshfeghi , col. 21 lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement a key transmitted with the management object, needed for communication through the network with the temporary software interface object to the authenticated manager to enable management access to the storage configuration information file as taught by Moshfeghi. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to utilized well known commercially successful technologies.

11. As per claims 8 and 16 Huang discloses the Java applet program transmitted to the manager in response to a request from the manager (col. 5 line 59-col. 6 line 4).

Java Virtual Machine is the crucial piece of every Java installation that allows Java programs (applets) to run on computer platforms.

12. The limitation of claims 6 and 14 are implicit: remote method invocation (RMI) is a part of the Java programming language library which enables a Java program running on one computer to access the objects and methods of another Java program running on a different computer. Both Huang and Moshfeghi provide their invention build on java technology and both inventions incorporate various authorization access (e.g. Moshfeghi, col. 5 lines 21-31 and col. 8 lines 58-65).

13. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6192361) in view of Moshfeghi (U.S. Patent No. 6476833). and further in view of Ludwig et al. (U.S. Pub. 20020198829).

Huang in view of Moshfeghi teach creating temporary interfaces by the management object permitting an access to files as discussed above.

Disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity would result in preventing the creation of temporary interfaces if a non-use period from most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

However, Huang in view of Moshfeghi do not teach preventing the creation of temporary interfaces if a non-use period from the most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are certified.

Ludwig et al. discusses different security measures including password authentication and suggests disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity (Ludwig et al. [51]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to disable accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity as taught by Ludwig et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make sure that unused accounts are inactive.

14. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6192361) in view of Moshfeghi (U.S. Patent No. 6476833). and further in view of Cabrera et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6029160).

Huang in view of Moshfeghi teach a system as discussed above.

Huang in view of Moshfeghi do not teach implementing a flag for temporarily stopping the use of the created interfaces in response to a maintenance request.

Cabrera et al. teach implementing a flag for temporarily stopping the use of objects in response to maintenance (Cabrera et al., col. 6 lines 39-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement a flag for temporarily stopping the use of the created interfaces in response to a maintenance request as taught by Cabrera et al. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to prevent any undesirable effects of accessing objects under maintenance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571) 272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis Jacques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


4/1/05


JACQUES H. LOUIS JACQUES
PATENT EXAMINER